



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,423	02/11/2004	Suryanarayana Murthy Gorty	ID-487 (80224)	2891

7590 08/20/2007
CHRISTOPHER F. REGAN, ESQUIRE
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.
P.O. Box 3791
Orlando, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER

KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/776,423

Applicant(s)

GORTY, SURYANARAYANA
MURTHY

Examiner

Michael E. Keefer

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3. Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :8/11/2006, 9/20/2004, 2/11/2004.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Application filed 2/11/2004.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On Page 8, line 5 "IMB's" should be deleted and replaced with --IBM's--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 18, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 2001/0029524), hereafter Smith.

Regarding **claims 1, 18, and 34**, Smith discloses:

a source of configuration data; and (Fig. 1, info 140 and info 142)

a configuration module that retrieves the configuration data at the request of a web service and is operative for generating data objects related to the configuration data and submitting each data object as a distributed object module to the web service. (Fig. 1, Email account compilation module 120 generates data objects from email account information (140, 142), which it then formats and sends to web services 170, 172 as distributed object modules (i.e. information that can be read by the services/application)

Regarding **claims 2, 21, and 35-36 as applied to claims 1, 18, and 34**, Smith discloses:

The configuration data is data used to access mailboxes. (Fig. 1, email account information 140, 142 is information used to access mailboxes)

Regarding **claims 3 and 22, as applied to claims 1-2, 18 and 21**, Smith discloses:

The web service comprises an ISP that uses the information to access another ISP's email. (Fig. 1, Universal mail application 100 provides an internet service that allows user 190 to access email at other mail service providers using configuration data 140, 142.)

Regarding **claim 4 as applied to claims 1-2**, Smith discloses:

A gateway to access a mailbox (Fig. 4 discloses gateway server 410 used to access the mailbox)

Regarding **claims 5 and 23 as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 18, and 23**, Smith discloses:

The configuration information is used on the fly as a user selects an email account to check. ([0037])

Regarding **claim 6 as applied to claim 1**, Smith discloses:

(Fig. 1) Email account compilation module 120 packages information from sources 140, 142 to be sent to email services 170, 172.

Regarding **claims 7 and 19 as applied to claims 1 and 18**, Smith discloses:

The source of configuration data is a user device. (e-mail account information is initially provided to the system via user device 190)

Regarding **claims 8 and 20 as applied to claims 1, 7, and 18-19**, Smith discloses:

A web client interface to the web service application is disclosed in [0018].

5. Claims 1, 18, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutsch et al. (US 2001/0034771), hereafter Hutsch.

Regarding **claims 1, 18, and 34**, Hutsch discloses:

a source of configuration data; and ([0334] discloses information stored in external sources)

a configuration module that retrieves the configuration data at the request of a web service and is operative for generating data objects related to the configuration data and submitting each data object as a distributed object module to the web service. ([0034] discloses importing data from external sources (i.e. generating data objects from configuration data), which is then converted into a tree view ([0042]) upon a user request (i.e. formatting the objects as distributed object modules to be sent to a web service ([0337]))

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 9-12, 16-17, 24-28, 33, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranshamaje (US 2004/0181580) in view of Temple ("The Complete Idiot's Guide to Microsoft Outlook 2000", page 16).

Regarding **claims 9, 24, and 37**, Baranshamaje discloses:

a user system having configuration data for accessing respective electronic mailboxes that are different from each other; and (Fig. 1, clients 30-36 have configuration data on them via the user.)

a configuration module that retrieves configuration data required for accessing the different electronic mailboxes of a user, wherein said configuration module is operative for generating data objects for each electronic mailbox relating to the configuration data, and submitting each data object as a distributed object module to a web service for configuring access to the respective electronic mailboxes associated with each data object from either the web service or a targeted electronic mailbox without requiring a user to provide manually any configuration data for each electronic mailbox. (Fig. 14-18 disclose collecting information from the user system (via the user), which is turned into data objects when the user submits the web forms, which is then turned into a profile which is saved onto a server (i.e. a web service), see also [0188] which discloses that the user may register multiple email accounts in this way and accessed individually.)

Regarding **claims 10, 25, and 38, as applied to claims 9, 24, and 37**,
Baranshamaje discloses:

Fig. 2A discloses importing account settings and formatting the data into a portable email account data structure. (To be used with web services, i.e. the webmail client, or the portable email client when connected to the internet.)

Regarding **claims 11 and 26 as applied to claims 9 and 24**, Baranshamaje discloses:

The use of a web client (Fig. 14 shows a screen capture showing the use of Microsoft Internet Explorer™)

Regarding **claims 12 and 27, as applied to claims 9, 24 and 26**, Baranshamaje discloses:

The use of a PC or wireless device to access the web service (clients 30-36 in Fig. 1)

Regarding **claims 16 and 33 as applied to claims 9 and 24**, Baranshamaje discloses:

A plurality of user systems (Fig 1, Clients 30-36)

Regarding **claims 17 and 28 as applied to claims 9 and 24**, Baranshamaje discloses:

The mailboxes reside on an internet server. (Fig. 1, servers 60 and 62)

Baranshamaje discloses all the limitations of claims 9-12, 16-17, 24-28, 33, and 37-38 except that the information is provided without the user manually providing the information.

The general concept of automatically importing email settings from email client programs on a user's computer is well known in the art as taught by Temple, which

teaches how an email program can import settings from other previously configured email programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Baranshamaje with the general concept of automatically importing email settings from email client programs on a user's computer as taught by Temple in order to eliminate user error when re-entering email account settings.

8. Claims 13-14, 29-30, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranshamaje and Temple as applied to claims 9, 24, and 37 above, and further in view of DeBusk et al. (US 2001/0016821), hereafter DeBusk.

Baranshamaje and Temple teach all the limitations of claims 13-14, 29-30, and 39-40 except for the configuration module being a COM ActiveX element.

The general concept of implementing a configuration module as a COM ActiveX element is well known in the art as taught by DeBusk. ([0064] teaches the use of ActiveX components in a system which gathers medical information about patients.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baranshamaje and Temple with the general concept of implementing a configuration module as a COM ActiveX element as taught by DeBusk in order to provide encapsulated reusable functionality.

9. Claims 15, 31, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranshamaje and Temple as applied to claims 9, 24, and 37 above, and further in view of Rajarajan et al. (US 2002/0143949), hereafter Rajarajan.

Baranshamaje and Temple teach all the limitations of claims 15, 31-32, and 41 except for the configuration data being stored in XML on the server.

The general concept of using XML to store configuration data for web service is well known in the art as taught by Rajarajan. ([0120]-[0122] teaches converting configuration data into an XML formatted file)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baranshamaje and Temple with the general concept of using XML to store configuration data for a web service as taught by Rajarajan in order to reduce the overhead by providing a uniform data storage format. (Rajarajan [0010])

10. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranshamaje, Temple, and Rajarajan as applied to claims 24 and 31 above, and further in view of Slothouber et al. (US 2003/0004961), hereafter Slothouber.

Baranshamaje, Temple, and Rajarajan teach all the limitations of claim 32 except that the web service is SOAP compatible.

The general concept of making a web service SOAP compatible is well known in the art as taught by Slothouber. ([0047])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baranshamaje, Temple, and Rajarajan with the general concept of making a web service SOAP compatible as taught by Slothouber in order to provide an extensible messaging format to transmit XML parameters to services.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael E. Keefer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 5:30am-2pm.

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 8/13/2007